

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

JERRY EUGENE SMITH,

Petitioner,

No. C 14-4438 PJH (PR)

vs.

**ORDER FOR RESPONDENT
TO SHOW CAUSE**

KEVIN CHAPELL,

Respondent.

Petitioner, a California prisoner, filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The amended petition was dismissed with leave to amend and petitioner has filed a second amended petition.

BACKGROUND

Petitioner was found guilty of a disciplinary violation while in prison which led to the loss of time credits. His habeas petition to the California Supreme Court was denied.

DISCUSSION

A. Standard of Review

This court may entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a); *Rose v. Hodges*, 423 U.S. 19, 21 (1975). Habeas corpus petitions must meet heightened pleading requirements. *McFarland v. Scott*, 512 U.S. 849, 856 (1994). An application for a federal writ of habeas corpus filed by a prisoner who is in state custody pursuant to a judgment of a state court must "specify all the grounds for relief available to the petitioner ... [and] state the facts supporting each ground." Rule 2(c) of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254. "[N]otice' pleading is not sufficient, for the

petition is expected to state facts that point to a 'real possibility of constitutional error.'" Rule 4 Advisory Committee Notes (quoting *Aubut v. Maine*, 431 F.2d 688, 689 (1st Cir. 1970)). "Habeas petitions which appear on their face to be legally insufficient are subject to summary dismissal." *Calderon v. United States Dist. Court (Nicolaus)*, 98 F.3d 1102, 1108 (9th Cir. 1996) (Schroeder, J., concurring).

B. Legal Claims

Petitioner's sole ground for federal habeas relief asserts that he was denied the opportunity to present a defense at the disciplinary hearing. This claim is sufficient to require a response.

CONCLUSION

1. The clerk shall serve by regular mail a copy of this order and the petition and all attachments thereto on respondent and respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California. The clerk also shall serve a copy of this order on petitioner.

2. Respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner, within sixty days of the issuance of this order, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted. Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that have been transcribed previously and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.

If petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the court and serving it on respondent within thirty days of his receipt of the answer.

3. Respondent may file a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds in lieu of an answer, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. If respondent files such a motion, it is due fifty-six (56) days from the date this order is entered. If a motion is filed, petitioner shall file with the court and serve on respondent an opposition or statement of non-opposition within twenty-eight (28) days of receipt of the motion, and respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner a reply within fourteen days of receipt of any opposition.

1 4. Petitioner is reminded that all communications with the court must be served on
2 respondent by mailing a true copy of the document to respondent's counsel. Petitioner
3 must keep the court informed of any change of address and must comply with the court's
4 orders in a timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for
5 failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). See *Martinez v.*
6 *Johnson*, 104 F.3d 769, 772 (5th Cir. 1997) (Rule 41(b) applicable in habeas cases).

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: February 26, 2015.



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge

9
10 G:\PRO-SE\PJH\HC.14\Smith4438.osc.wpd
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28